DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 244 SO 007 804

AUTHOR Seifman, Eli
TITLE Structured Field-Based Experiences for a Social Studies Secondary Teacher Certification Program. Occasional Paper Series No. 74-5.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook. American Historical Association Education Project.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Inquiry Training; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Observation; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Professional Training; *Social Studies; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; Tutoring

ABSTRACT

In 1972, new goals in teacher education and certification, based on performance or competency-based teacher certification, required the redesigning of New York state certification programs. Modifications in 1943 and 1963 had already required a fifth year of graduate study and supervised student teaching, usually as a culminating experience, for certification. At the university campus at Stony Brook the new program, which is both competency- and field-based, contains an introductory course with structured field-based experiences. In the spirit of accountability and public sharing, the substance of this course is presented in this overview of course content and components and collection of 14 field-based investigations. The course covers social studies as a subject taught in the secondary schools, particularly the curricular materials, teaching strategies, learning activities, and modes of evaluation used in secondary instruction. Teacher education students choose five field-based investigations which include observation, participation, tutoring, and possibly micro-teaching in order to integrate clinical experience with the theoretical understandings gained through the other course components of individualized reading, directed activities, and an independent project. (JH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 097214

American Historical Association History Education Project

Occasional Paper Series

Dr. Eli Seifman, Series Editor

Occasional Paper #74-5

STRUCTURED FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES FOR A SOCIAL STUDIES SECONDARY TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

by
Dr. Eli Seifman
(The State University of New York at Stony Brook)

American Historical Association History Education Project
The State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York
1974

SO 007 804

American Historical Association History Education Project

The State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York

© Eli Seifman 1974

INTRODUCTION

Although teacher certification in New York State has undergone a number of changes since 1936 when all candidates were required to complete a baccalaureate degree (including a student teaching experience), until recently the modifications have generally taken the form of requiring additional or advanced course work. Thus, in 1953 a fifth-year requirement of thirty hours of advanced graduate study was required for permanent certification of teachers of academic subjects (e.g. English, social studies, foreign languages, etc.) and special subjects (e.g. art, physical education, industrial arts, etc.). Twenty years later, in 1963, a similar fifth-year requirement was instituted for elementary school teachers as well. New York State Education Department accreditation teams visited colleges and universities offering teacher certification programs, evaluated the facilities, faculty, and the general operation of the program. If acceptable, the programs were accredited, registered, and approved.

The mid-1960's witnessed a growing interest in and attention to the specification of behavioral outcomes of learning and the concept of accountability in education. Robert F. Mager's influential little book, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962) emphasized the point that if teachers were not sure where they were going, then they were liable to end up someplace else. The book was (and is) widely used by teachers as a handbook for the design of objectives which describe learning in both measurable and observable behaviors of the learner. Mager's emphasis is on what the learner will be DOING (emphasis his), and recommends the following scheme for writing objectives which will describe the desired behavior of the learner:

> First, identify the terminal behavior by name; we can specify the kind of behavior which will be accepted as evidence that the learner has achieved the objective.
> Second, try to further define the desired behavior by describing the important conditions under which the behavior will be expected to occur.
> Third, specify the criteria of acceptable performance by describing how well the learner must perform to be considered acceptable. 1

Leon Lessinger has defined accountability as, "a regular public report by independent reviewers of demonstrated student accomplishment promised for the expenditure of resources." [2] This definition has several important implications. First, that educational personnel clearly state the performance(s)--i.e. behavior(s)--students will demonstarte, and specify the criteria used to judge the performance(s). Second, that "outside" reviewers, applying the stated objectives, conditions, and criteria of evaluation, will be able to function as "independent educational accomplishment auditors." Third, that the report of student accomplishment is shared with the public.

By the 1970's, the accountability movement had developed such momentum that statements on accountability were included in the Presidents' Message on Educational Reform to the Congress of the United States (March 3, 1970), written into the contract between the Board of Education of the City of New York and the United Federation of Teachers, called for in grant proposals to the U. S. Office of Education, etc.[3]

It was in this climate of increased awareness and sensitivity to behavioral objectives and accountability that New York State embarked upon a change in its procedures for teacher certification. Unlike the earlier modifications of 1943 and 1963, New York State's new performance or competency-based teacher certification program (referred to as PBTE or CBTE) calls for revolutionary changes in teacher certification

The basis for New York State's new procedures and standards for accreditation of programs leading to certification for public school service was set forth in the "Teacher Education and Certification Section" of the 1972 Regents Plan for the Development of Post Secondary Education. According to official publications of the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, the goal and underlying assumptions of the Teacher Education and Certification Section of the 1972 Regents' Plan are as follows:

Goal:

To establish a system of certification by which the State can

assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.
Underlying convictions:
The basis for certification should be teacher competence rather than total reliance on college courses. Possession of a State certificate should represent an acceptable level of competence in general background knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and teaching skill.

The preparation of teachers should involve a number of pertinent agencies and individuals including: schools, higher institutions, professional staffs, and other relevant agencies. The ideal professional training would integrate theoretical understanding and clinical experience in a system of mutual refinement and reinforcement.[4]

To implement the goal of the Regents' Plan, all new certification programs submitted after September 1, 1973 are required to provide evidence that:

1. Participating agencies (school district, college, appropriate professional staff of the school district, etc.) have shared significantly in program planning and decisions, and have accepted the roles and responsibilities jointly identified in plannning.
2. Program goals derive from realistic assessment of functions of appropriate professional personnel.
3. Program goals are appropriate and comprehensive.
4. Entrance requirements (if any), techniques of assessing schievement, and standards and conditions of demonstrating achievement are clearly stated and made known to students.
5. Candidates who will be recommended for certification have demonstrated achievement of the program's goals.
6. A program evaluation system has been established and will operate to identify and correct program weaknesses.[5]

Currently-existing programs must be re-designed according to the following schedule:

Certification Field	Deadline date for program revision	Date beyond which individual certification applications will not be accepted
1. Elementary, (N-6 & N-9) and special education (teachers of the handicapped)	February 1, 1975	February 1, 1976
2. School administration and supervision (SDA and SAS)	February 1, 1976	February 1, 1977
3. Secondary (7-12) academic subjects	February 1, 1977	February 1, 1978
4. Pupil personnel service areas	February 1, 1978	February 1, 1979
5. Special subjects and occupational subjects	February 1, 1979	February 1, 1980 [6]

Although previous New York State certification programs included a supervised student teaching experience, this usually took the form of a

culminating experience, typically taken by students in their senior year. For many students, particularly those preparing to teach at the secondary school level, this may have been the first (and probably only) field-based experience in their teacher education program.

New York State's new teacher certification program is both competency and field-based. That is, there is a new emphasis on a much broader conception of the relationship between theory and practice, between the integration of "theoretical understanding and clinical experience."

Toward this end, Stony Brook's Secondary Social Studies Teacher Certification Program (SSS/TCP) has attempted to modify its program to include field-based experiences in the early stages of a student's entry into the program; specifically, in the introductory course, Education 397, "Teaching Social Studies."

The following documents describe the general course objectives, the overall design for achieving these course objectives, and the "protocols" for the structured field-based experiences which are addressed to a sub-set of the general course objectives. These structured field-based experiences will be implemented during the 1974-1975 academic year, during which time they will be monitored and evaluated both by the participants and "outside" reviewers. In the spirit of accountability, we wish to identify and "make public" the texts of the trial "protocols" for these structured field-based experiences, so that the materials can be shared with participating personnel and agencies.

FOOTNOTES

1. Robert F. Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1962), p.12.

2. Dwight W. Allen, and Eli Seifman, The Teacher's Handbook (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971), p.73.

3. Ibid., p.72.

4. "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" (Albany, New York: The State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, September 1, 1973), pp.1-2.

5 Ibid., p.8.

6. "Competence-Based Certification Newsletter," No.5, November, 1973 (Albany, New York: The State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification), p.1.

DOCUMENT #1: COURSE DESCRIPTION SHEET

This document is to be distributed and reviewed in detail with the students during the first class meeting. The intent is to specify and "make public" the general course objectives and the overall design for achieving these objectives--i.e. the curriculum materials, the teaching strategies and learning activities, and the mode of evaluation.

1. COURSE TITLE & DESCRIPTION: Education 397, "Teaching Social Studies"
A study of social studies as a subject taught in the secondary schools: the nature of the social studies; curricula models; scope & sequence of topics offered; new programs of social studies instruction; etc. Designed for prospective teachers of social studies in secondary schools.
Prerequisites: Minimum of five Social Science courses beyond the introductory level.
Instructor: Dr. E. Seifman
Credits: 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. COURSE COMPONENTS:

2.1 Class Sessions:

2.1.1 Plenary Class Mode: Introduction & presentation of themes & topics, informatio & data, theoretical models, substantive issues, etc.--for discussion, analysis & evaluation.

2.1.2 Plenary & Group Modes: Preparation, presentation, analysis, & evaluation of specific teaching strategies, learning activities, curriculum materials, teaching-learning problems, educational issues, etc.

2.2 Readings:

2.2.1 Directed Readings/Class Focus: Readings as data base for focus of class sessions (discussion, analysis, & evaluation of substantive issues; actually try out suggested teaching strategies & learning activities; etc.).
Directed readings include the following:
(1) Common Text: Edgar B. Wesley & Stanley R. Wronski, Teaching Secondary Social Studies In A World Society, 6th ed. (Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1973)
(2) Common Curriculum Materials: AEP Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studi Project Unit Books (titles include: Communist China; The Immigrant's Experience; The American Revolution; Race and Education)
(3) Common Pamphlets: NCSS, How To Handle Controversial Issues
(4) Other Selected Readings, Documents, etc. Provided By Instructor: e.g. N.Y. syllabus, social studies curriculum materials catalogs, etc.

2.2.2 Individualized Readings/Out-of-Class Focus: Individualized "extended" readings (books, monographs, periodicals, research reports, U.S. Government documents, etc.) on topics introduced in class sessions. The object is both "substantive" (to encounter additional data, insight, suggested practices, points of view, current trends, contorversies, etc.) & "procedural" (to familiarize yourself with basic reference works, sources, & literature in the field of social studi education).

2.3 Directed (Common) Activities: Applying the principles of selected instructional models to the design of actual teaching strategies, learning activities, curriculum materials, diagnostic & evaluative instruments, etc.

2.4 Directed (Individualized) Field-Based Experiences: Field-based experiences in second schools (e.g. observation, participation, tutoring, possibly micro-teaching, etc.).

2.5 Independent Project: An independent project, related to course objectives, developed in collaboration with the instructor: this includes agreement upon the type of proje objectives; procedure for carrying out project; procedure for reporting or presentin "finding"; & method of evaluating the project.

2.6 Formal Examinations: (Mid-Semester & End-of-Semester) Opportunity to demonstrate competencies (knowledge,skills, behaviors) developed through class sessions & direct readings.

[Note: TBD= To Be Determined]

3. EVALUATION:

CATEGORIES	WEIGHT (W)	$\bar{X}S$	W x $\bar{X}S$
Examinations* (N=2)	4		
Directed Activities** (N=TBD)	2		
Individualized Readings (N=TBD)	1		
Field-Based Experiences (N=5)	1		
Independent Project (N=1)	1-4		

$\Sigma W =$ ☐ $\Sigma W \times \bar{X}S =$ ☐

* E.1 (W2) + E.2 (W2) = 4

** Since all directed activities may not be of the same level of significance or difficulty, each will be assigned a "weight" (W). $\bar{X}\ W/DA = \frac{\Sigma\ W/DA}{\Sigma W}$

FINAL GRADE= $\frac{\Sigma\ W \times \bar{X}S}{\Sigma\ W}$

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK

Documents #2-15: STRUCTURED FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES

These "protocols" for the structured field-based experiences are to be distributed and reviewed in detail with the students during the second class meeting. The intent is to emphasize the nature of the field-based experiences and their relationship to the Social Studies Secondary Teacher Certification Program (SSS/TCP). Students are asked to select five (5) structured field-based experiences of their choice, but are also encouraged to select a variety of different types of experiences--rather than select five of the same type. It should be noted that the number "five" was selected in terms of the instructor's estimate of reasonable work-load for the course and the problems associated with travel to schools in a region without public transportation (Suffolk County, New York); the number will be reviewed both during and after the operation of the course.

SOCIAL SCIENCE/SOCIAL STUDIES

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Procedure:

Background: You are majoring in one of the social sciences or one of the interdisciplinary social science type majors. Presumably you have been studying a body of knowledge which has some relationship to social studies as a subject taught in the secondary schools.

2.1 Observe at least three different grade levels of social studies classes (grades 6-1

Grade Level	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Note: A single observation may/may not be sufficient to adeuately answer 2.2: it may be necessary to informally chat with the teacher & students in order to get a better sense of the "course" as a whole, rather than base your judgements simply on a single class session.

2.2 Analyze the relationship between your college preparation in your social science major and social studies as a subject taught at the secondary school level. [i.e. How would you evaluate your command of the secondary social studies subject matter at each of the grade levels observed? What special contributions could you bring to the secondary social studies curriculum at each of the grade levels observed? etc.]

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about your subject matter preparation as related to the secondary social studies curriculum?

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS OBSERVATION

Types:
___ Plenary Class Mode
___ Individualized/Independent Work Mode
___ Group Work Mode
___ Large Group Instruction Mode
___ Team Teaching Mode
___ Other

1. Setting:
   1.1 Where? (school district, school, etc.)

   1.2 When? (day, date, time, etc.)

   1.3 Grade(s)/Teacher(s)

   1.4 Class size:

#Male	
#Female	
Total #	

   1.5 "Type" of class (i.e. below average, average, ab ove average, etc.) + How do you know?

2. Arrangements (How were arrangements made for the visit and observation?):

3. Teaching-Learning Process :

   3.1 Topic(s) of focus:

   3.2 Summary description of teaching-learning process

	Summary Description
Objectives	
Curriculum Materials	
Teaching Strategies & Learning Activities	
Evaluation	

   3.3 Observation/Comments, etc.:

4. Evaluation:
   4.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about
      4.1.1 The school
      4.1.2 The class
      4.1.3 The curriculum materials
      4.1.4 This particular instructional approach
      4.1.5 The teaching-learning process in general
      4.1.6 Yourself

   4.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience.

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENT OBSERVATION

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, time, etc.)

2. Procedure:

Select one student on whom you will focus your observation.

2.1 Describe how & why you selected the particular student you selected for observation.

2.2 Write a "running summary" of the behavior of the student (e.g.Answers teacher's question, "How did...?"; Asks question, "If,...then why...?"; sits quietly; leaves the room; returns after 25 minutes; etc.)

2.3 Evaluate what you think the student learned as a consequence of the teaching-learnin situation (i.e. the class period, the field experience, etc.)

2.4 Comments/Observations, etc.

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about

3.1.1 The student

3.1.2 Yourself

3.1.3 Teaching

3.1.4 Learning

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience.

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SOCIAL STUDIES SYLLABUS: STATE/LOCAL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Procedure:

Background: The State Education Department of the State of New York has established a social studies syllabus for grades K-12 which identifies a specific focus for each grade (e.g. Grade 9: "Asian & African Culture Studies), specific topics (e.g. Grade 9: Topic #1, "World cultures today; Topic #2, "Africa south of the Sahara: land & people "; Topic #5, "China," etc.), stated understandings (e.g. Grade 9: Topic #5 "China," A KEY TO UNDERSTANDING THE TRADITIONAL CULTURE OF CHINA IS TO EXAMINE THE MANNER OF CREATIVE EXPRESSION IN ITS ARTS), and related content (e.g. Grade 9, Topic#5, "China," "Certain common characteristics of artistic expression also common to Chinese culture of the past include:.... Effects of the writing system on the arts: calligraphy as relates to painting; limitations imposed by the characters upon expressions in poetry, other literature.")

2.1 Based upon a field experience at a secondary school, analyze the relationship between the official New York State syllabus for a specific grade (other than grade 12) & the social studies curriculum being used at the particular grade in that particular school. [i.e. Is it identical, similar, different, completely different, etc.?] If different, how so? Why?

2.2 Comments/ Observations, etc:

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about curriculum requirements?

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTS

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Procedure:

Analyze a social studies text ("basic text," "supplemental text," "major text," etc.) currently being used in the school.

2.1 Complete bibliographic reference:
[Author's last name, first name, Title (Place of publication: Publisher, Date), pp.]

2.2 How used? [i.e. students given copy; available only for in-school use; available for both in-school & out-of-school use; course built around text("basic text"); text supplements course work ("supplemental text"); assignments based on readings from text; use of text's questions etc. as basis for assignments (no use, some use, high use); etc]

2.3 Select a topic on which you have a very weak cognitive background. Evaluate the text's treatment of this topic.

2.4 Select a topic on which you have a very strong cognitive background. Evaluate the text's treatment of this topic.

2.5 Select a topic which is (or has potential for being) highly controversial. Evaluate the text's treatment of this topic & specify the criteria you are using for your evaluation.

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything were you able to learn about social studies texts and their use?

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable
				X

(c) 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM MATERIALS

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of School district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Curriculum materials:

2.1 Name of major social studies curriculum materials used.

2.2 Unit cost (i.e. @$)

2.3 How was decision made to purchase/use these materials?

2.4 Brief description of materials

2.5 Description of how these curriculum materials used.

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about

3.1.1 How curriculum materials are selected

3.1.2 Your own ability to recommend "better materials" at not greater unit cost

3.1.3 Your own ability to recommend "comparable materials" at a lower unit cost

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

UP-TO-DATE CURRICULUM MATERIALS AND/OR DATA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Procedure:

Background: For some educational objectives the issue of curriculum materials &/or data which are the most up-to-date is of little or no importance; while for other educational objectives, curriculum materials &/or data which are the most "up-to-date" is of crucial significance . [e.g. Consider the case of a replica of the original flag of the U.S. vs. the current flag of the U.S.; or a photograph of President Lincoln vs. a photograph of the current President; or the name of the former Governor of the State vs. the name of the present Governor of the State---and consider different types of educational objectives.

2.1 Based upon a field observation, identify instances of educational objectives for which "up-to-date" curriculum materials &/or data are of crucial significance.

2.2 Analyze the relationship between the curriculum materials &/or data which were used (available in the school, class, text, etc.) & their impact upon students' attainment of the educational objectives. [i.e. Is non-up-to-date material &/or data learned as "up-to-date" material &/or data? Does anyone notice or care if the materials &/or data are not "up-to-date"? etc.]

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about the concept of "up-to-date" curriculum materials &/or data?

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SOCIAL STUDIES LEARNING PROBLEMS INTERVIEW

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, location, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Interview Procedure: [Interview five students of the same grade level. Interview questions follow:]

Background/Introduction: Students generally report that some aspects of a subject, or topics, etc., are easier to learn than others; & that some aspects give them more difficulty than others.

2.1 In your social studies class, are there any such topics or kinds of things that you find relatively easy to learn? (Please describe + why?)

2.2 In your social studies class, are there any such topics or kinds of things that you find hard to learn--i.e. they give you difficulty? (Please describe + why?)

2.3 Could you suggest one possible recommendation for helping someone like yourself who has difficulty with that kind of thing in social studies? (Please describe your recommendation)

3. Observations/Comments, etc.

4. Evaluation:

4.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about

4.1.1 Student perceptions of "social studies"

4.1.2 Student perceptions of "learning problems"

4.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

TUTORIAL EXPERIENCE Type: 1:1 Relationship

1. Setting:
   1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, location, etc.)

   1.2 When? (Day, date, time/duration, etc.)

2. Tutee:
   2.1 Age
   2.2 Sex
   2.3 Grade

3. Tutorial Focus: Summary statement or description (e.g. Steps of how a bill becomes a law; How to compile a bibliography; Map rea-ing skills; etc.) + How was this particular focus selected or determined.

4. Tutorial Procedure:

	Summary Description
Objectives	
Diagnosis	
Curriculum Materials	
Teaching & Learning Strategies & Activities	
Evaluation	

5. Comments/Observations, etc.

6. Evaluation:
   6.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about
      6.1 The subject matter (i.e. content)
      6.2 The student
      6.3 The 1:1 approach
      6.4 The criteria you accept as evidence that learning has/has not taken place

   6.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience.

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

TUTORIAL EXPERIENCE

Type: 1:2-5 Relationship

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, location, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, time/duration, etc.)

2. Tutees:

	Ages	Grade(s)
Male		
Female		

3. Tutorial Process:

3.1 Tutorial Focus: Summary statement or description (e.g. Steps of how a bill becomes a law; How to compile a bibliography; Map reading skills; etc.) + How was this particular focus selected or determined.

3.2 Tutorial Procedure:

	Summary Description
Objectives	
Diagnosis	
Curriculum Materials	
Teaching Strategies & Learning Activities	
Evaluation	

3.3 Comments/Observations, etc.

4. Evaluation:

4.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about

4.1.1 The dynamics of a small group

4.1.2 Types of teaching strategies/learning activities which maximize the potentials of the small group

4.1.3 Your own preferences for working in a 1:1 or 1:2-5 type relationship

4.1.4 Ways you responded to/did not respond to specific students within the small group

4.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

SCHOOL BOARD MEETING

1. Setting:
   1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)
   1.2 When? (Day, date, time, etc.)

2. School Board Membership:
   2.1 Present/Absent:

	Male	Female
Total #		
# Present		

   2.2 Sex/Age:

	20's	30's	40's	50's	60's	70's	80's	90's (Appro
Male								
Female								

   2.3 Observations/Comments, etc.:

3. Audience:
   2.1 Distribution:

	Total #	# Students	# Non-Students
Male			
Female			

   2.2 Observations/Comments, etc.:

4. Agenda:
   4.1 Summary of items on agenda &/or items discussed.

   4.2 Observations/Comments, etc.

5. Evaluation of Field Experience:
   5.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about each of the following, and what is the basis for your judgement or conclusion?
      5.1.1 The "community" (i.e. the school district)
      5.1.2 The school board
      5.1.3 The parents
      5.1.4 The teachers
      5.1.5 The administrators
      5.1.6 The students
      5.1.7 "Other"

   5.2 Rate the "value" of this experience for you & explain the basis (criteria) for your evaluation.

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

   5.3 Explanation:

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

1. Setting:
   1.1 Where? (Name of school disrtict, school, etc.)

   1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Procedure:
   Background: The school exists as both an institution of the larger society and of the local community (i.e. school district, neighborhood, etc.). In the social studies in particular, some topics & issues may be considered highly controversial & may generate a good deal of conflict between & among teachers, students, parents, administrators, community members, etc. Schools often develop policies & procedures for "handling" (or not handling) controversial issues & topics.

   2.1 Inquire as to whether or not the school (or school district) has established any set of principles, policies, or procedures for "handling" controversial issues & topics in the social studies.

YES	NO

   2.2 Describe the principles, policies, or procedures established for "handling" (or not handling) controversial issues & topics. [Identify the "source" of your data.]

   2.3 Inquire as to whether or not there has ever been a case of a conflict concerning the actual handling of a controversial issue or topic in the social studies.

Yes	No

   2.4 If "Yes," describe or relate the case study: What was the issue or topic? Why was it considered controversial? How was it resolved? etc.

3. Evaluation:
   3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about
      3.1.1 The community
      3.1.2 Controversial issues & topics

   3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

GRADING & EVALUATION INTERVIEW

1. Setting:

1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, location, etc.)

1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Interview Procedure: [Interview five students concerning last year's final social studies "report card" grade.] [Interview questions follow:]

2.1 What was the final grade?

2.2 How did you(student)interpret the grade (i.e. "What do you think that means as a final grade for the course?")

2.3 How do you think the instructor arrived at that final grade?

2.4 Do you think the final grade was fair/unfair? + Why?

2.5 If you were in charge of evaluating student performance in that social studies class, how would you have done it? [i.e. you are asking the student for his/her suggestions for arriving at a final grade]

2.6 Applying your suggested system of evaluation, what final grade would you have received?

3. Evaluation:

3.1 What (if anything) were you able to learn about

3.1.1 Student perceptions of the grading & evaluation process & procedure

3.1.2 The grading & evaluation process & procedure

3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)

GRADING POLICIES

1. Setting:
   1.1 Where? (Name of school district, school, etc.)

   1.2 When? (Day, date, etc.)

2. Grading Policies and Procedures:

   2.1 Summary statement describing grading policies of school + identify "source" of these policies (If possible, attach any relevant data: policy statement, report card etc.)

   2.2 Summary statement of grading procedures of school (e.g. use of letter grades & their meanings; use of numerical grades & their meanings; use of anecdotal report, e

   2.3 [OPTIONAL] Tally of distribution of class set of grades for last marking period

3. Evaluation:
   3.1 What (if anything) did you learn ab out school grading policies & procedures?

   3.2 Rating & Explanation of the "value" of the experience

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Valuable	Extremely Valuable

© 1974 by E. Seifman (SUNY at Stony Brook)